## United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

| Name of Assigned Judge<br>or Magistrate Judge | James B. Moran   | Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge                  |           |  |
|---|------------------|---|-----------|--|
| CASE NUMBER                                   | 98 C 7108        | DATE  | 10/1/2001 |  |
| CASE<br>TITLE                                 | Michael J. Vallo | Michael J. Vallone et al. Vs. CNA Financial Corp. etc. et a |           |  |

| <u></u> | 11111  | 2   |  |                                  |                                     |  |
|---------|--|---|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| MO      | OTION:   | [In the following bo<br>of the motion being | x (a) indicate the party filing the motion, e.g., plaintiff, d<br>presented.]  | efendant, 3rd party plaintiff, a | nd (b) state briefly the natur      |  |
|         |  |   | Memorandum Opinion and Order   | •                                |                                     |  |
| DO      | CKET EN  | TRY:  |  |                                  |                                     |  |
| (1)     |  | Filed motion of [ use lis                   | ting in "Motion" box above.]   |                                  |                                     |  |
| (2)     |  | Brief in support of motion                  | on due   |                                  |                                     |  |
| (3)     |  | Answer brief to motion                      | due Reply to answer brief due  |                                  |                                     |  |
| (4)     |  |   | set for at   |                                  |                                     |  |
| (5)     |  |   | inued to] [set for/re-set for] on set fo   | or at                            |                                     |  |
| (6)     |  |   | /continued to] [set for/re-set for] on   |                                  |                                     |  |
| (7)     |  | Trial[set for/re-set for] o                 |  | w-                               | <b>*</b>                            |  |
| (8)     |  |   | ng] held/continued toat  |                                  |                                     |  |
| (9)     |  | This case is dismissed [v                   | This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to]  □ FRCP4(m) □ General Rule 21 □ FRCP41(a)(1) □ FRCP41(a)(2). |                                  |                                     |  |
| (11)    | to rest<br>listed  | in its second amended                       | Enter Memorandum Opinion and Ordew them in camera. Defendant is directly privilege log within the next fourteed the state of the original minute order.] | ected to furnish each            | to put this matter of the documents |  |
|         |  | equired, advised in open court.             |  |                                  | Document at Ar                      |  |
|         | No notices required.   |   |  | number of notices                | Number                              |  |
|         | Notices mailed by judge's staff.  Notified counsel by telephone. |   |  | OCT 0 1 200}                     |                                     |  |
| 1       | <del> </del>   |   | (D)  | date dockered                    |                                     |  |
|         | Mail AO 450 form.  |   |  | docketing deputy initials        | $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$       |  |
|         | Copy to judg   | e/magistrate judge.                         | EU-7<br>FILED FOR DOCKETING  | overing deputy limitals          |                                     |  |
|         | WAH  | courtroom deputy's initials                 | 01 OCT -1 PH 2: 06   | date mailed notice               |                                     |  |
|         | <del> </del>   | 111111111                                   | Date/time received in central Clerk's Office   | mailing deputy initials          |                                     |  |

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

| MICHAEL J. VALLONE and                      | )               |             |
|---|-----------------|-------------|
| JOYCE E. HEIDEMANN, and JAMES               | )               |             |
| J. O'KEEFE, on behalf of themselves         | )               |             |
| and all other plaintiffs similarly situated | )               |             |
| known and unknown,                          | )               |             |
|   | )               |             |
| Plaintiffs,                                 | )               |             |
|   | )               |             |
| VS.   | ) No. 98 C 7108 |             |
|   | )               |             |
| CNA FINANCIAL CORPORATION,                  | )               | DOCKETEL    |
| a/k/a CNA Casualty of Illinois, and         | )               |             |
| The CONTINENTAL INSURANCE                   | )               | OCT 0 1 200 |
| COMPANY, and all their subsidiaries,        | )               | 9 - 200     |
| parent companies, partnerships, and         | )               |             |
| corporations,                               | )               |             |
|   | )               |             |
| Defendants.                                 | )               |             |
|   |                 |             |

## MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiffs, by a motion to compel and a second motion to compel, seek the complete files of Melvin Katzman, who was vice-president and associate general counsel for Continental Insurance Company, as well as all documents between certain Bates numbers that defendant claims are privileged. Defendant has now skinned down its privilege log to 23 documents, and it is those documents that are at issue.

It is not enough, of course, that plaintiffs believe, or at least hope, that the documents may be helpful to them if they are indeed privileged. And, at first blush, they do appear to be privileged. In plaintiffs' reply they seek *in camera* review rather than production. The documents are few in number and Katzman wore two hats, both as an officer and as an attorney. It is therefore conceivable that the privilege might not extend to some of the documents. The easiest way to put this matter to rest is for the court to review them *in* 

camera. Defendant is directed to furnish each of the documents listed in its second amended privilege log within the next fourteen days.

Senior Judge, U. S. District Court

\_\_, 2001.